presumption that the fusion of effects is primarily and essentially a purely psychical fusion.

Our knowledge of the corresponding facts in the other sense-spheres is less complete; but what we have points in the same direction. When, for example, you hear some complex of tones simultaneously sounded, it seems probable that the ears analyse the complex physical impression into its simple constituents ; that these affect distinct neurones and neurone-chains; and that the re-synthesis of the complex, your consciousness of the complex of tones to which each partial contributes something of its quality, is the product of a purely psychical fusion.

Or, again, take an instance very familiar to me by reason of my imperfect hearing. You listen to the reading of a paper and find it just not loud enough to be heard: i. e., you hear the sounds, but you cannot catch the meaning of the words. Then you allow your eyes to follow a written copy of the address, and you hear distinctly all the words and fully appreciate their meaning. There is no good ground for believing that the simultaneous visual and auditory excitations fuse into some one complex neural process; rather, everything points to the view that they remain essentially distinct and separate cerebral processes, and that the common meaning is a superadded activity provoked in part by the one and in part by the other; that therefore the meaning, to the evocation of which both neural processes, the auditory and the visual, continuously contribute, is a

purely psychical activity without *immediate* unified or integrated physical correlate among the processes of the brain.

Now turn to the other line of evidence pointing in